Reply.—It is observed that there is no prayer for dispensing with the Neet of adoption. The Adiyara in such cases corresponds to the succession duty levied in other countries and is, in this instance, merely a fee for the waiver of the contingent right of escheat. As such, it is a prerogative of the Sovereign and cannot be renounced. It is true that in the case of Kootukars or collateral heirs this fee has been given up, probably on the principle that collateral heirs may succeed eventually. When strangers come in, this reason cannot, in the nature of things, be made to apply. It is admitted that such cases are few and even in most of them remission is granted by the generosity of His Highness the Maha Rajah. That the amount of collection under a certain impost is small is an argument cutting both ways. It may be given up, if not opposed to principle. It can be easily paid, if it is not heavy. In reference to difficulties mentioned in the enquiries touching the valuation of properties, all care will be taken to avoid delay and hardship.

The same reply holds good in regard to Mr. Mathevan Pillai's proposal also. If, however, any new aspects are presented in the memorandum promised by him, they will be considered.

185. That marriages should be registered.

Mr. Ponnaiya Nadar of Eraniel (*Nominated*) in whose name this subject stood was absent.

Reply.—The subject is too vague and cannot be answered.

186. Registry of marriages among Mahomedans.

Mr. Shaik Sulaiman Labba of Agastisvaram (*Nominated*) requested that arrangements might be made by Government for the proper registry of marriages among Mahomedans.

Reply.—This is a matter for the members of the Mahomedan community to arrange among themselves. But if any specific act has to be done in the matter by Government, it will be attended to, if an application is made.

187. Provision of Satroms for all classes.

Mr. Shaik Sulaiman Labba of Agastisvaram (*Nominated*) requested that a separate satrom might be constructed for the accommodation of Mahomedan and Christian wayfarers at Kottar.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. M. Bhuthalingam Pillai (*Eraniel*) said that he learnt that a portion of the existing Hindu satroms was to be set apart for the use of Christians and Mahomedans, but as this would be inconvenient, he prayed that separate satroms, where necessary, might be built at Government cost for them also.

Mr. G. H. Gunther (*Catholic Indian Association, Trivandrum*) said that Europeans and Eurasians could use Travellers' Bungalows and Hindus could accommodate themselves in Government satroms. Native Christian travellers were not permitted at present to resort to either of these buildings and this resulted in much inconvenience and hardship to them. He therefore prayed that early steps might be taken by Government for giving them some protection on the way.

Mr. Warkey John (*Travancore and Cochin Roman Catholic Association, Kottayam*) represented that the treatment accorded to Native Christians in this respect was inconsistent with the liberal policy pursued by Government.

Reply.—The answer given last year seems sufficient, *viz.*, that the matter will be considered as funds permit. But any special arrangement which does not involve heavy cost or the erection of separate buildings will be considered, if proposed in reference to particular places.

188. Delay in the grant of applications for permission to erect churches.

Mr. G. H. Gunther (*Catholic Indian Association, Trivandrum*) said that generally permission for building places of Christian worship was granted expeditiously enough, but in some individual cases owing to the delay and dilatoriness of subordinate officers much inconvenience was caused to the applicants. He requested the issue of stringent instructions for preventing the delay complained of.

Mr. Warkey John (*Travancore and Cochin Roman Catholic Association, Kottayam*) pointed out that in former times permission for the erection of churches used to be granted more freely than now, and in places like Parur, Alleppey and Kallupara, Hindu and Christian places of worship were built on adjoining lands. In these days, however, the presence of a snake-grove or the image of a Dharmadaiva or even a solitary Hindu dwelling anywhere near was deemed sufficient reason for withholding the permission so earnestly sought. The

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly